PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	North Cal-Neva Resource Conservation and Development Council	**Amount Requested**	$ 1,148,410
Proposal Title	Upper Pit River DAC Infrastructure Improvement Projects	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 1,938,660

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes 3 projects claiming the following benefit types: water supply and water conservation. The projects include: (1) Joint Leak Detection and Repair Program, (2) McArthur Water Tank, and (3) Bieber Water Tank Refurbishment Project.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	10/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	2/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	21/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**57**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The goals and objectives are listed for each individual project, and documented how the projects relate to the goals and objectives of the IRWMP. The application includes a tabulated overview of the projects with their summary and status including CEQA and permits. Tasks include appropriate deliverables including quarterly and final reporting. However, data management and monitoring deliverables are not discussed. The level of detail is proportionately adequate with project complexity. Maps are also included. While the projects are standalone they are linked by issue area in that they would improve the drinking water supply and quality of three DAC in the region. The application includes historical information demonstrating the need and purpose of the projects to address the outdated small system infrastructure issues to improve DACs drinking water quality and water supply. The scope included reporting with quarterly and final reports.

BUDGET

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Application includes a summary budget and individual project budgets. Tasks are consistent with work plan and budget tasks except for Project 1. There is no information about how the hourly rates were determined and some personnel rates are listed as lump sum. Construction estimates for all projects are missing or not sufficient. They are primarily lump sums with no backup documentation to support the values.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The schedule is presented as a simplified gantt chart, but there are no months or years assigned to the chart, making start and end dates impossible to determine. Also, there are no identified linkages between tasks or project milestones. The schedule contains subtasks that are not included in the work plan. For example, the Project 1's schedule includes subtasks 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 which are not present in the work plan.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The monitoring targets are appropriate for the benefits, and the feasibility of meeting targets within the life of the projects is demonstrated. However, a few project goals do not have corresponding performance indicators. For example, Project 2's goal to reduce need to have crews driving to monitor wells and tanks does not have a corresponding performance indicator.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits and is fully supported by well described physical benefits and documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects. The application provides sufficient information that identifies and describes the physical benefits of each project contained in the proposal. In particular, the water supply and conservation benefits are all described and well-justified as is the monetized annual savings.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis, and clear and complete documentation.

This application includes three projects which would increase water supply reliability, conserve water by detecting and stopping conveyance leaks, and build a new water storage tank to reduce operating costs. Two of the projects use cost-effectiveness analysis to show they are cost-effective. One uses benefits analysis; quantified benefits are less than costs, but reduced costs of fire insurance were not included. The quality of this application is very good for projects of this size.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that one program preferences and four statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for five of the Preferences claimed: (1) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (2) Drought Preparedness; (3) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (4) Climate Change Response Actions; and (5) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality.